



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,207	03/01/2002	Lascelles A. Linton	LINT102	3489

21658 7590 03/07/2007
DYKAS, SHAVER & NIPPER, LLP
P.O. BOX 877
BOISE, ID 83701-0877

EXAMINER

KHATTAR, RAJESH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3693

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/090,207	LINTON, LASCELLES A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rajesh Khattar	3693	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on March 1, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's application filed on March 1, 2002. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Information Disclosure Statement has not been filed with the application. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8 and 15 recite the limitation "the present invention". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter. See detailed discussion below.

The subject matter courts have found to be outside of, or exceptions to, the four statutory categories of invention is limited to abstract ideas, laws of nature and natural phenomena. These three exclusions recognize that subject matter that is not a practical application or use of an idea, a law of nature or a natural phenomenon is not patentable. See, e.g., *Rubber-Tip Pencil Co. v. Howard*, 87 U.S. (20 Wall.) 498, 507 (1874) ("idea of itself is not patentable, but a new device by which it may be made practically useful is"); *Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co. v. Radio Corp. of America*, 306 U.S. 86, 94, 40 USPQ 199, 202 (1939) ("While a scientific truth, or the mathematical expression of it, is not patentable invention, a novel and useful structure created with the aid of knowledge of scientific truth may be."); *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 ("steps of 'locating' a medial axis, and 'creating' a bubble hierarchy . . . describe nothing more than the manipulation of basic mathematical constructs, the paradigmatic 'abstract idea'").

The courts have also held that a claim may not preempt ideas, laws of nature or natural phenomena. The concern over preemption was expressed as early as 1852. See *Le Roy v. Tatham*, 55 U.S. (14 How.) 156, 175 (1852) ("A principle, in the abstract,

is a fundamental truth; an original cause; a motive; these cannot be patented, as no one can claim in either of them an exclusive right.”); *Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co.*, 333 U.S. 127, 132, 76 USPQ 280, 282 (1948) (combination of six species of bacteria held to be nonstatutory subject matter). Accordingly, one may not patent every “substantial practical application” of an idea, law of nature or natural phenomena because such a patent “in practical effect be a patent on the [idea, law of nature or natural phenomena] itself.” *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 71-72, 175 USPQ 673, 676 (1972).

A claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. The applicant's invention is directed to a method or a process and thus falls within an enumerated statutory class.

However, not all processes are statutory under 35 USC Section 101. To be statutory, a claimed process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation which a practical application is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application which produces a useful, tangible, and concrete result. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 183-84, 209 USPQ at 6.

Upon making the determination that the invention is a method or process that falls within an enumerated statutory class, the Examiner must now determine whether the claimed invention falls within one of the Section 101 judicial exceptions, i.e., is the invention directed to laws of nature, natural phenomena or an abstract idea. Moreover, in evaluating whether the claims meet the requirements of section 101, the Supreme Court requires the Examiner to consider the claims as a whole to determine whether the

invention is for a particular application of an abstract idea, rather than an abstract idea itself.

Inventions directed to nothing more than abstract ideas (such as mathematical algorithms), natural phenomena, and laws of nature are not eligible and therefore are excluded from patent protection. *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185, 209 USPQ at 7; accord, e.g., *Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. at 309, 206 USPQ at 197; *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 589, 198 USPQ 193, 197 (1978); *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 67-68, 175 USPQ at 675; *Funk*, 333 U.S. at 130, 76 USPQ at 281. "A principle, in the abstract, is a fundamental truth; an original cause; a motive; these cannot be patented, as no one can claim in either of them an exclusive right." *Le Roy*, 55 U.S. (14 How.) at 175. Instead, such "manifestations of laws of nature" are "part of the storehouse of knowledge," "free to all men and reserved exclusively to none." *Funk*, 333 U.S. at 130, 76 USPQ at 281.

Thus, "a new mineral discovered in the earth or a new plant found in the wild is not patentable subject matter" under Section 101. *Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. at 309, 206 USPQ at 197. "Likewise, Einstein could not patent his celebrated law that $E=mc^2$; nor could Newton have patented the law of gravity." *Ibid*. Nor can one patent "a novel and useful mathematical formula," *Flook*, 437 U.S. at 585, 198 USPQ at 195; electromagnetism or steam power, *O'Reilly v. Morse*, 56 U.S. (15 How.) 62, 113-114 (1853); or "[t]he qualities of * * * bacteria, * * * the heat of the sun, electricity, or the qualities of metals," *Funk*, 333 U.S. at 130, 76 USPQ at 281; see *Le Roy*, 55 U.S. (14 How.) at 175.

While abstract ideas, natural phenomena, and laws of nature are not eligible for patenting, methods and products employing abstract ideas, natural phenomena, and

laws of nature to perform a real-world function may well be. In evaluating whether a claim meets the requirements of section 101, the claim must be considered as a whole to determine whether it is for a particular application of an abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature, rather than for the abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature itself.

The Examiner must ascertain the scope of the claim to determine whether it covers either a § 101 judicial exception or a practical application of a § 101 judicial exception. The conclusion that a particular claim includes a § 101 judicial exception does not end the inquiry because “[i]t is now commonplace that an application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a known structure or process may well be deserving of patent protection.” Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 (emphasis in original); accord Flook, 437 U.S. at 590, 198 USPQ at 197; Benson, 409 U.S. at 67, 175 USPQ at 675. Thus, “[w]hile a scientific truth, or the mathematical expression of it, is not a patentable invention, a novel and useful structure created with the aid of knowledge of scientific truth may be.” Diehr, 450 U.S. at 188, 209 USPQ at 8-9 (quoting Mackay, 306 U.S. at 94); see also Corning v. Burden, 56 U.S. (15 How.) 252, 268, 14 L.Ed. 683 (1854)(“It is for the discovery or invention of some practical method or means of producing a beneficial result or effect, that a patent is granted . . .”).

It appears that the applicant is directing the invention to terms of the contract and to a legal concept - an escrow account. The Examiner asserts that the applicant's invention is directed to a legal concept and thus is an abstract idea. The Examiner now must determine if the applicant's invention is a particular application of an abstract idea.

For claims including such excluded subject matter to be eligible, the claim must be for a practical application of the abstract idea, law of nature, or natural phenomenon. *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 (“application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a known structure or process may well be deserving of patent protection.”); *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 71, 175 USPQ at 676 (rejecting formula claim because it “has no substantial practical application”).

To satisfy section 101 requirements, the claim must be for a practical application of the § 101 judicial exception, which can be identified in various ways:

- (a). The claimed invention “transforms” an article or physical object to a different state or thing.
- (b) The claimed invention otherwise produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, based on the factors discussed below.

The applicant’s invention does not transform an article or physical object to a different state or thing. Transferring goods or transferring rights to goods via an instrument allows the goods to remain in the same state, albeit allowing them to change physical locations.

For eligibility analysis, physical transformation “is not an invariable requirement, but merely one example of how a mathematical algorithm [or law of nature] may bring about a useful application.” *AT&T*, 172 F.3d at 1358-59, 50 USPQ2d at 1452. Since the Examiner determined that the claims do not entail the transformation of an article, the Examiner must review the claim to determine if the claim provides a practical application that produces a useful, tangible and concrete result. In determining whether the claim is

for a "practical application," the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible and concrete, but rather that the final result achieved by the claimed invention is "useful, tangible and concrete." The claim must be examined to see if it includes anything more than a § 101 judicial exception. If the claim is directed to a practical application of the § 101 judicial exception producing a result tied to the physical world that does not preempt the judicial exception, then the claim meets the statutory requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 101. If the examiner does not find such a practical application, the examiner has determined that the claim is nonstatutory. In determining whether a claim provides a practical application that produces a useful, tangible, and concrete result, the examiner considers and weighs the following factors:

For an invention to be "useful" it must satisfy the utility requirement of section 101. The USPTO's official interpretation of the utility requirement provides that the utility of an invention has to be (i) specific, (ii) substantial and (iii) credible. MPEP § 2107 and Fisher, 421 F.3d at ___, 76 USPQ2d at 1230 (citing the Utility Guidelines with approval for interpretation of "specific" and "substantial").

The Examiner asserts that the applicant's invention has a specific, substantial and credible result and thus produces a useful result.

The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a § 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that § 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world

result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application."). "[A]n application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a ... process may well be deserving of patent protection." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 (emphasis added); see also Corning, 56 U.S. (15 How.) at 268, 14 L.Ed. 683 ("It is for the discovery or invention of some practical method or means of producing a beneficial result or effect, that a patent is granted . . ."). In other words, the opposite meaning of "tangible" is "abstract."

The Examiner asserts that the method claim does not produce a real-world result, or beneficial effect and thus has no substantial application. The invention as claimed is either directed to an escrow or legal concept and thus is directed to an abstract idea.

Another consideration is whether the invention produces a "concrete" result. Usually, this question arises when a result cannot be assured. In other words, the process must have a result that can be substantially repeatable or the process must substantially produce the same result again. In re Swartz, 232 F.3d 862, 864, 56 USPQ2d 1703, 1704 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (where asserted result produced by the claimed invention is "irreproducible" claim should be rejected under section 101). The opposite of "concrete" is unrepeatable or unpredictable. Resolving this question is dependent on the level of skill in the art.

The Examiner asserts that the applicant's invention is not repeatable or predictable. The invention is directed to trying to control human behavior based on an abstract intellectual or legal concept which provides an obligation for a person to do or

Art Unit: 3693

not do something. The results of the invention cannot be assured since trying to control human behavior with an abstract intellectual or legal concept is not assured. It is up to the party whether the party actually abides by the abstract intellectual or legal concept and honors the obligation set forth in the abstract intellectual or legal concept. The Examiner asserts that this control of human behavior is not predictable since only the party knows whether he/she will honor the obligation.

Even when a claim applies a mathematical formula, for example, as part of a seemingly patentable process, the examiner must ensure that it does not in reality "seek[] patent protection for that formula in the abstract." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 191, 209 USPQ at 10. "Phenomena of nature, though just discovered, mental processes, abstract intellectual concepts are not patentable, as they are the basic tools of scientific and technological work." Benson, 409 U.S. at 67, 175 USPQ at 675. One may not patent a process that comprises every "substantial practical application" of an abstract idea, because such a patent "in practical effect would be a patent on the [abstract idea] itself." Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676; cf. Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 (stressing that the patent applicants in that case did "not seek to pre-empt the use of [an] equation," but instead sought only to "foreclose from others the use of that equation in conjunction with all of the other steps in their claimed process"). "To hold otherwise would allow a competent draftsman to evade the recognized limitations on the type of subject matter eligible for patent protection." Diehr, 450 U.S. at 192, 209 USPQ at 10. Thus, a claim that recites a computer that solely calculates a mathematical formula (see

Art Unit: 3693

Benson) or a computer disk that solely stores a mathematical formula is not directed to the type of subject matter eligible for patent protection.

The applicant's invention is effectively directed to an abstract intellectual legal concept. For applicant to get a patent on an abstract intellectual legal concept such as presented in this application, would allow applicant to have a patent on the abstract concept of the terms of contracts or legal instruments in which terms and conditions are inherent. Any practical application of an escrow/legal instrument/contract is going to be involved in the transfer of patented goods or the transfer in rights to goods via a legal instrument involving a patent. Since applicant's recited claims are so broad, applicant's invention, in essence, encompasses every practical application of an escrow/contract/legal instrument. Thus, applicant is seeking protection of a legal concept.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta, US Patent No. 6,865,559 (herein after Dutta) further in view of Shaw US Patent Application No. 2003/0004859 (herein after Shaw).

Art Unit: 3693

Regarding, claims 1 and 9, Dutta discloses a method for reducing the occurrence of fraud in a commercial transaction between a seller and a buyer, said method comprising the steps of:

the buyer and seller agreeing on a third party (col. 6, lines 7-12, the third party in the reference is an escrow service company);

the buyer and seller agreeing on a fourth party (col. 9, lines 5-15; the fourth party in the reference is an inspection service company);

the buyer depositing said payment amount with said third party (col. 6, lines 27-30; the third party is an escrow service company); and

buyer indicates satisfaction with said commercial transaction, said third party tenders said good faith money and said payment amount to said seller (Abstract; col. 6, lines 33-36).

Regarding claim 4, Dutta discloses said seller and said buyer agree on said fourth party by agreeing to allow said third party to select said fourth party (col. 8, lines 59-65, the third party (escrow service) selects itself to perform functions of said fourth party (inspection service)).

Regarding claims 5, 6, 13 and 14, Dutta discloses third party provides escrow services and facilitates said commercial transaction for said buyer and seller (col. 2, lines 1-10; col. 5, lines 1-12; col. 6, lines 7-12).

Dutta does not specifically disclose buyer and seller agreeing on a good faith money amount. However, Shaw discloses buyer and seller agreeing on a good faith money amount ([0149], in this case user (buyer) have to agree ahead of time

(presumably with the seller) to have a good faith deposit or earnest money). Therefore, it is obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Dutta to include the good faith money amount as taught by Shaw. One would have been motivated to do so in order to demonstrate that both seller and buyer have genuine interest in carrying out the commercial transaction.

Examiner notes that the limitation "seller depositing an amount of money equal to said good faith money amount with said third party, said good faith money amount held in trust by said third party" would flow from the step of buyer and seller agreeing to a good faith money amount. Therefore, this limitation is inherent to buyer and seller agreeing to a good faith money amount.

Examiner notes that the conditional statement as cited by the applicant e.g. if said buyer indicates dissatisfaction...was given little/no patentable weight as these event may not happen.

6. Claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of Shaw and further in view of Colosi et al., US Patent Application No. 2002/0128942 (herein after Colosi).

Dutta and Shaw describe the invention as disclosed above. Both Dutta and Shaw fail to teach the limitation of fourth party being a charity. Colosi teaches that the buyer could assign part or all of his interest in the rebate (deposit/payment or buyer's money) to third party entities as he see fit, for example, to charities, etc ([0045]). Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Dutta and Shaw to incorporate third (fourth) party

Art Unit: 3693

being a charity as taught by Colosi. One would have been motivated to do so in order to make sure that the deposit/payment money stays out of the hands of buyer and seller.

7. Claims 7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta, US Patent No. 6,865,559 (herein after Dutta) in view of Shaw US Patent Application No. 2003/0004859 (herein after Shaw) and further in view of Abecassis US Patent No. 5,426,281 (herein after Abecassis).

Dutta and Shaw describe the invention as disclosed above. Both Dutta and Shaw fail to teach the limitation of holding the money in a trust for a predetermined amount of time. Abecassis teaches holding the money for a predetermined number of days before tendering the good faith money and the payment amount to the seller (col. 4, lines 23-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Dutta in view of Shaw to incorporate the teachings of Abecassis. One would have been motivated to do so in order to complete the transaction in the absence of buyer's intervention.

Examiner further notes that the use of conditional language e.g. if said buyer neither indicates satisfaction nor dissatisfaction.... is given little or no patentable weight as these events may/may not happen.

8. Alternatively, claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Escrow definition as described in Black's Law Dictionary (see attached).

Escrow is defined as a writing, deed, money, stock, or other property delivered by the grantor, promisor or obligor into the hands of a third person, to be held by the latter until the happening of a contingency or performance of a condition, and then by him delivered to the grantee, promise or oblige. A system of document transfer in which a deed, bond, or funds is delivered to a third person to hold until all conditions in a contract are fulfilled; e.g. delivery of deed to escrow agent under installment land sale contract until full payment for land is made. Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to extend the teachings of the Escrow definition as described in Black's Law Dictionary to formulate Applicant's claimed limitations. One would have been motivated to do so in order to utilize escrow (third party) to secure a commercial transaction.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure US Patent No. 5426281, 5794207, 6609113, 6336095; US Patent Application No. 20010032165, 20010039524, 20010047306, 20020077956, 20020077978, 20020111907, 20020128967, 20020161724, 20020161707, 20030004859, 20030105710, 20030130940, 20030140004, 20030212631, 20040167797, 20050131816.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rajesh Khattar whose telephone number is 571-272-7981. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8-5.

Art Unit: 3693

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RK
Feb. 27, 2007

 2/28/07
JAMES A. KRAMER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600